

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA DIVISION

Marie Assa’ad-Faltas, MD MPH,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. 3:14-cv-3431-TLW
)	
The Gingliat Savitz and Bettis Law Firm,)	
<i>in its corporate capacity</i> ; Stephen Savitz,)	
<i>individually</i> ; Tiffany Lurke, <i>officially as</i>)	
<i>employee of Palmetto Health Richland</i>)	
<i>Hospital for injunctive relief and</i>)	
<i>individually for damages</i> ; Frank Voss, Jr.,)	
<i>individually for damages</i> ; Palmetto Health)	
Richland Hospital (“PHRH”), <i>for damages</i>)	
<i>and for injunctive relief</i> ; and all agents of)	
PHRH who injured Plaintiff on 23 August)	
2013 and thereafter, <i>individually and for</i>)	
<i>damages and officially for injunctive relief</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

ORDER

Plaintiff Marie Assa’ad-Faltas, proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, filed this action alleging state law claims and claims brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter is now before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett, to whom this case was assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), (D.S.C.). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that this Court dismiss the Complaint without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. (Doc. #11). Plaintiff filed preliminary objections to the Report on October 10, 2014 (Doc. #15), supplemental objections on October 28, 2014 (Doc. #19), and an additional

attachment to the supplemental objections on October 31, 2014 (Doc. #20). This matter is now ripe for disposition.

In conducting this review, the Court applies the following standard:

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the report and recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

Wallace v. Housing Auth. of the City of Columbia, 791 F. Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992) (citations omitted).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Report and Plaintiff's objections and supplemental objections thereto in accordance with this standard, and it concludes that the Magistrate Judge accurately summarizes the case and the applicable law. Accordingly, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED** (Doc. #11), and Petitioner's objections and supplemental objections thereto are **OVERRULED** (Doc. #15, 19). For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, the Complaint is **DISMISSED** without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. Plaintiff's motion for leave to file electronically is **DENIED** as **MOOT**. (Doc. #14).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Terry L. Wooten
Terry L. Wooten
Chief United States District Judge

November 5, 2014
Columbia, South Carolina